HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JUL 22 1916
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

The Protestant Review

Volume XXXIII, Number 7

July, 1916

Nathan and the Pope.

THE ADDRESS OF SIGNOR NATHAN,

ex-Mayor of Rome, which has enraged the pope and has excited American Romanists to Boycott the Panama Exposition.

THE POPE'S UNPRECEDENTED REPLY.

SIGNOR NATHAN'S REJOINDER.

32 PAGES. PRICE TEN CENTS A COPY.

Why must We Fight the Roman Church?

By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"An admirable address."—The Guardian of Liberty.

The President and the "Pan-American" Political Thanksgiving Mass,

By the Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"A powerful pamphlet."—The Guardian of Liberty.

"Ought to be written in golden letters and posted on every door of the whole White House; . . . ought to be sent to every senator, congressman, preacher and editor in this land."—P. A. Seguin, ex-priest and author.

"The best thing I have seen in a long time, and I read most all of the patriotic papers."—V. L. W.

The Protestant Review

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE
Published by
CHRIST'S MISSION
EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.
Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.
MANUEL FERRANDO, Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street, NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXIII. JULY, 1916. No. 7.

CONTENTS

	Page
"One Thing Have I Desired" (Poem). By Ruth Graham Robinson	194
Editorial Notes—Purgatory	195
Bible Burning in Mexico. By Eglon Harris (concluded)	198
Rome's Kidnapping Bill. By Gilbert O. Nations, vice-president Free Press Defence League	200
New York Charity Investigation. By P. S. B.	203
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons—LI. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando	205
Centre Shots at Current Issues. By Geo. P. Rutledge	210
Why Nuns Cut Off Their Hair. By the Editor	213
Monsignor Dunn's Denial. By the Editor	216
The Secret Code of the Pope	224

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year	**$1.50**	**To Ministers and Missionaries**	**$1.00**
Single copy	15	Twenty or more copies, each	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Protestant Review, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date of the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

"ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED"

If I could live without Thee, let me not!
  If I could rest before I rest in Thee,
  Oh, keep me restless! Let me never be
Content with any—all—and Thou forgot.
If endless happy life could be my lot,
  Without the hope that I Thy face shall see,
  Better than that were seven deaths to me!
Once having loved Thee, could I love Thee not?

Ah, that I could—this is my sorest fear!
  The deeps of ill in me are dark and dread,
And I might learn to walk, as men do here,
  Guided by sparks of some self-kindled fire.
  O Thou, the end of every high desire,
Be all my light the glory round Thy head!

—Ruth Graham Robinson.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JUL 22 1916
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

The Protestant Review

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."
(1 Cor. 16: 13.)

Vol. XXXIII JULY, 1916 No. 7

EDITORIAL NOTES

PURGATORY

A friend has sent me a clipping, being an article published by the Rev. Joseph A. Murphy, of St. Jerome's Catholic Church, Brooklyn, entitled, "Where the Soul Goes After Death. Heaven, Hell and the Intermediate Purgatory."

My friend asks me to write on the important question of Purgatory, and as the subject requires more space than these notes permit, I have decided to treat it fully in my next pamphlet for the Truth and Freedom Association, and shall only attempt here a few remarks on the subject, as my space permits.

The Roman Church bases this colossal fraud on tradition and a few passages of the Scriptures.

Tradition comes to us from the practise of the early Christians, records of which are supposed to be found in the Catacombs, and some mutilated liturgical remnants.

Setting aside the question of the genuineness of these relics, the word *Purgatory* is not to be found in them, nor any reference to the captivity and suffering of souls after death. If among the early Christians there existed such a pious custom as gathering about the tombs of their dead, it was rather with the object of commemorating the good works of the deceased as an example to the living.

This becomes more apparent when, in studying the works of the Fathers, we see that, in trying to reconcile with Christianity the different pagan ideas concerning the state of the soul after death, they never refer to any established custom or belief of the Apostolic Church or early Christians.

The Scriptural authority on which the Roman Church bases this doctrine is to be found in the following:

First. In that God, in spite of forgiving the sin of Moses and Aaron, did not remit the penalty, which was that they should not enter the land of Canaan. Therefore, even though He absolves sin, its penalty must be undergone in Purgatory.

Second. In the Second Book of Maccabees, 12: 46, which says: "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." But the Church herself says in the introduction to the books of the Maccabees: "It is not known who was the author of the books. But as to their authority, though they are not received by the Jews, . . . they are received by the Church, who, in settling her canon of the Scriptures, chose rather to be directed by the tradition she had received from the Apostles of Christ than by that of the Scribes and Pharisees. And as the Church has declared these two books canonical, . . . there can be no doubt of their authenticity." But how can the Church claim the authority of the Apostles, when neither they nor Christ Himself ever made any reference to these books?

Third. In Matt., 12: 31, 32: "Therefore I say unto you: Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men, but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." (Douay translation.)

This passage may be somewhat obscure, but to use it as an authority for the existence of Purgatory seems as illogical as it would be to say that there cannot be forgiveness of sins in this life, but a hope for the life to come, because Jesus said, "Whosesoever sins ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven," etc., or in other words, "Whosesoever sins ye shall loose *in this world* shall be loosed in the *world to come*." To me the figures seem to be very similar.

Fourth. In 1st Corinthians 3: 13-15: "Every man's work shall be manifest. For the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire. And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's

work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

If our readers will but look through the whole chapter they will see by the context that this passage is no authority for the doctrine of Purgatory. There may be found in it, however, a lesson of great importance against the use of worldly means in the conduct of Church work. Nowadays when so much stress is laid on advertising, business methods, fairs, social service, etc., etc., people are apt sometimes to lose sight of the gold, silver and precious stones of spiritual things and devote themselves to the wood, hay and stubble, which must disappear when tried by the fire of Christ's judgment.

Fifth and last. We quote from Father Murphy: "St. Paul prays for his departed fellow-worker, Onisephorus, that 'the Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day.'" (2 Tim. 1 : 18.)

In the first place the Church has no proof that Onisephorus was dead at the time of the writing of this epistle. She only infers it for the sake of establishing the doctrine of Purgatory.

In the second place, giving to the above words the sense given by the Church, they are more consistent with the doctrine of Origen, that the souls that were detained at death could not enter Heaven until the last day, or, in other words, the end of the millennium. But to me, they are only a confirmation of the doctrine of Paul already referred to that every work must be tried to see if it shall endure, and that he prayed God that the works of the faithful Onisephorus, who ministered to him, should be counted as gold, that he might receive the reward Paul's grateful heart desired for him.

The above are the only grounds upon which the Church has built the doctrine of Purgatory. The reader may judge if they are sufficient basis for this doctrine which has been the occasion for the perpetration of greater frauds than almost any other of Rome's teachings, as I hope to prove at length in the pamphlet above referred to.

In conclusion, the following quotation from Father Murphy's article will show our readers the origin of the errors of the Roman Church:

"Reason may indicate the existence of Purgatory, but where

is the Scriptural warrant for it? some may ask. Although there is a basis in the Bible for this doctrine, we take occasion to state here that even if there were not, *it would not make one iota of difference to the teaching of the Catholic Church.* The Catholic Church does not base her teachings solely on Scripture. Indeed, the Bible, as such, was not in existence when the Church was founded. The Church is a living organization, reaching back to the days of her Founder, Jesus Christ, and she has taught with His authority throughout the ages, and thus will she ever teach.

"Her answer to every query as to the ground on which she bases her doctrine, is: 'My Founder taught me—I heard Him preach it and He bade me give it to the world.'"

The above quotation needs no comment, but we want to add a paragraph taken from the profession of faith to which every dignitary of the Church from the superior of a convent, or professor of theology up, has to subscribe before taking possession of the dignity:

"The apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the Church I most firmly admit and embrace. Also the sacred Scriptures, in the sense which has been held and is held by Holy Mother Church, to whom alone it is given to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures, I admit."

BIBLE BURNING IN MEXICO

BY EGLON HARRIS.

(Concluded.)

I went into a house one day where there were two men, to whom I presented a Bible, told them the price, and asked them if they would like to buy it. One said: "I could not read this." Thinking that he referred to his eyesight, I spoke in Spanish, meaning to say, "I suppose your sight is not good." What I really said was: "I suppose you have the evil eye." (I did not know Spanish so well then.) They laughed, and bought a Bible each, then asked me to come into the street. Shaking the Bibles from the covers, they burned each one! Afterward I found that one of them had given me a bad dollar. A shopkeeper across the

street called me to him and said: "Do you know who these men are?" "No." "They are priests in laymen's clothes." He then asked me if I would come over once a month and let him be my agent in Cordova for the distribution of the Word of God. The result was that soon we were having meetings there, through the burning of these two Bibles in the public street.

When living in Orizaba, I was returning from a missionary journey when I got into conversation with an Indian chief. He called 400 Indians, to whom I spoke of the Saviour. I left with them a few copies of the Gospels, but I had only gone about one mile toward home when I was overtaken and clapped into prison, and a huge beam placed against the door. About half an hour later the beam was moved, and the door swung open. A voice said: "Now you may go." I stepped outside, but saw no one, so thankfully started on my eight miles walk to Orizaba. About seven months later a Mexican met me and said: "I should advise you not to go to Ixhuatlancillo, unless you carry a pistol. I am the judge of Ixhuatlancillo. Your wife saved my wife's life. Seven months ago I went to see the chief, and he told me he had a prisoner. From his description I knew it must be you, so I insisted upon your release." I then learned that I had been imprisoned by order of the priest.

On one occasion I visited Tlacotalpan, where the Roman version of the Scriptures had been circulated. A girl called to me across the street: "Do you know anything of a book which tells of some girls being invited to a wedding, and they went to buy wine?" She showed me the leaf of a burnt Bible, saying: "I picked this up," and pointed out to me the words, "and while they went to buy, came the bridegroom." After the word "came" the page was torn away. (The Spanish word for "came" (vino) also means wine.) This led to my giving this girl a copy of the New Testament. The next time I went to Tlacotalpan, I met with some men who said: "We were hoping to see you to talk to you about having a meeting in this place." They had met together and drawn up a paper signed by twelve prominent persons in the town, asking that we should send a teacher to teach this book. We have sold 124 Bibles in that place. This happened something like eighteen years ago.

ROME'S KIDNAPPING BILL

Passes the House—One of the Most Vicious Measures Ever Attempted in the United States.

BY GILBERT O. NATIONS, VICE-PRESIDENT FREE PRESS DEFENSE LEAGUE, 52 BLISS BLDG., 35 B ST., N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

On Monday, April 24th, the Juvenile Court Bill for the District of Columbia was passed by the House of Representatives in a rather stormy session. Patriotic representatives made a valiant fight to defeat the measure, but the united strength of the Roman Catholic members and those who serve the vast Roman Catholic constituencies, was sufficient to pass it with many members not voting.

The Americans secured the yeas and nays, however, and thus put the members on record. Opposition to the bill was heavily handicapped in the House because the bill was drawn up by the professor of sociology in the Catholic University at Washington, and other parties outside of Congress, and introduced in Congress by Ben Johnson, the Roman Catholic member from Kentucky, and quickly reported favorably from the committee of which Mr. Johnson is chairman, before it had come to the attention of the people. The fight is now shifted to the Senate, where the friends of liberty should quickly pelt it with an avalanche of protests addressed to their respective senators.

It will go first to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, composed of Senators Smith, of Maryland; Phelan, Hollis, James, Saulsbury, Martin, of Virginia; Dillingham, Jones, Works, Kenyon, Sherman and Sterling. If favorably reported from that committee, it will next come up on the floor of the Senate. Those who favor papal politics in the House hurled sulphurous denunciations at Americans who have dared to oppose the measure, but this was not the first thunder that has emanated from Rome, and it will not be the last.

Section 5 states that the bill is drawn on the theory that the child is the ward of the State. In the vast majority of cases this theory is fundamentally wrong and vicious. Under the common law, and, indeed, under all law, both human and divine, the child is the ward of its parents, and becomes the ward of the State only in the absence of any natural or legal guardian.

Section 13 provides that when a child has been apprehended and brought before the court for violating any ordinance or regulation of the city, no further effort need be made to notify the parents than service on some person above the age of sixteen, residing on the premises where the child may be found. If the child should be from home on business or a visit, service on a servant, black or white, would be sufficient, even though the servant might be a total stranger or an enemy to the child or parent, and faithless to the interests of both.

Section 14 authorizes the judge, when so disposing of a child without notice to its parents, to appoint a guardian ad litem to represent the child and conduct the defense. Such guardians ad litem are usually appointed from bystanders who are present by accident or design. Such appointee would probably know nothing of the child or its parents, and could easily betray both.

Section 15 empowers the judge, after causing the arrest of an infant, to dispose of the case secretly in his chambers and to withhold the record from the inspection by any except the guardian ad litem. With Jesuitical cunning it is provided that the "records shall be open to inspection of such child, his parents, guardians, or authorized representative." But the word "or" is disjunctive, and would entitle one, but not all, the persons mentioned to see the record. Inspection by the guardian ad litem would exhaust the virtue of the provision. Moreover, the right to inspect the record, even if secured to the child, would be useless mockery in case of a young infant incarcerated in a distant private or sectarian prison.

Section 20 directs the judge, after capturing the child and trying it secretly and without notice to the parents, to commit it *"to any institution, association, or corporation, willing to receive it*, that may care for children within or *without* the District of Columbia." The child might be in a private prison in San Francisco or the Pacific Islands before the parents could know of its disappearance, and they would be powerless to ascertain its whereabouts.

Section 22 vests the court with power to compel parents whom it has bereft of their infant to pay the private or sectarian prison for its alleged support, and to punish with a fine of $200 and imprisonment for six months every failure of those too poor to

make such payments. With such crushing vengeance could the judge silence the voice of "Rachel weeping for her children."

Section 25 contains a deceptive and dishonest provision that the child shall, *"so far as practicable,"* be committed to some custody of the same religious faith as its parents. But suppose the parents had no religious faith, or that their faiths were different! Moreover, the provision is so cleverly expressed that courts will hold, as they have uniformly held in construing such provisions, that it has no binding or mandatory force, and may be disregarded at pleasure by the judge.

Section 29 directs the judge to invite keepers of private and sectarian prisons to diligence in the rounding up and capture of children.

The effect of the act is to deprive the helpless child of even the rights secured to an adult criminal. It is so framed that, while the operation of the writ of habeas corpus might ultimately be enforced on appeal therefor to the higher courts, prima facie an answer to such writ would be supplied by the record of commitment by the juvenile court—and few such victims will ever find friends able and disposed to spend their time and money in appeals to vindicate the rights secured by the Constitution under that writ. Wherefore practically it abolishes, so far as helpless children are concerned, the writ of habeas corpus; and as no crime is to be charged, but arrest and restraint of liberty may follow upon the mere allegation or whim of an informer, the right of trial by jury is made a farce.

Adults have the protection of the presumption of innocence, and the right of habeas corpus *even if accused of crime.* By this bill denying crime as even imputed, it is proposed to deprive the child of its liberty till majority, and to deprive the parent of his right to the service, custody, care and admonition of his child, by authority of the State and regardless of the inherent rights of citizens generally.

If it were planned by vicious people to gain control of children for vicious purposes, as has been done under vicious forms of government, no more effective means could be devised than the insidious provisions of this bill, masked as they are under a thin film of mock beneficence.

The bill goes to the root of the liberties of a free people. It

is not possible for the child once caught in the toils laid in this bill to escape. There is no assault upon liberty so to be censured as an assault upon the totally helpless, and none so infamous as an assault upon the liberty of the child.

This bill is in forty-six sections, and covers twenty-eight pages, and is therefore too voluminous to publish in the newspapers. For that reason attention is specifically called to some of its sinister and vicious provisions. Friends wishing to examine it closely should ask their respective senators for copies, as private citizens cannot obtain unlimited supplies of such measures. It is known as H. R. 13048.

Write your senator a brief, strong letter of protest. If he answers that he will give it careful attention, tell him his answer is unsatisfactory, and that you wish to know how he intends to vote, so you may know how to vote when your turn comes.

NEW YORK CHARITY INVESTIGATION

The investigation into the Charity situation in New York State is holding the interest of all those who are anxious to see fair play and who have the interest of the dependent children at heart. Very important disclosures have been made by Messrs. Doherty, Kingsbury, Reeder, and others connected with the State Charity Department, and these disclosures show that the miserable conditions surrounding dependent children are not confined to any one particular sect, but that Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish institutions which are receiving the support of the State and city are equally culpable. In connection with the disclosures it has been shown that fourteen Protestant and twelve Roman Catholic institutions were condemned by the city investigators as not meeting the proper qualifications. As a result of this, the Roman Catholic Church, through bishops, priests and laymen, has inaugurated a campaign of vituperation and slander with not only the intention of impugning the testimony of experts, but also of blackening their characters. Messrs. Kingsbury and Doherty, the Charity Commissioner and his assistant, the former a Protestant and the latter a Roman Catholic, have been specially selected for attack and the testimony shows that

Mr. Doherty's life has been threatened and his family intimidated. The Roman Catholics charge that the exposures are anti-Catholic, in spite of the fact that more Protestant institutions were criticized than Roman Catholic; and the Rev. William B. Farrell, of Brooklyn, when called before the Strong Commissior to testify, was insulting in the extreme and defied the authority of Commissioner Strong, appointed by the Governor, and indirectly defied the Governor of the State of New York. It was amusing to hear this priest demand the right to think, speak and write as he wished under his constitutional privilege, while at the same time one of his fellow townsmen and adherents is attempting to muzzle the press of the United States by a bill that he is introducing into Congress.

We have investigated and are convinced that the hearings are absolutely impartial and we shall exert every influence to prevent the Roman Catholic Church from succeeding in having the investigation discontinued. There can be no question that Governor Whitman is being importuned daily to close the investigation, but we also know that the patriotic forces are using every influence to have him keep his hands off. It remains to be seen whether the Rev. Mr. Farrell can be made to speak or whether he shall continue to defy the civil authority and attack the reputations of reputable men. It is interesting to note that Mayor Mitchell, a Roman Catholic, has stood firmly by Commissioner Kingsbury and is now being singled out for the same sort of attacks as were made on his co-religionist, Mr. Doherty. We believe that this Charity investigation furnishes a concrete case which bears out our contention that a Roman Catholic official cannot be a loyal citizen and a loyal Roman Catholic at the same time. It is seldom that we see it so clearly brought forth, as we do not know how many thousands of them put the Church first and the State last. In the case of Mr. Doherty the State has been put before the Church, and he has at every point performed his duties as a citizen and a responsible State official and has performed them impartially. For doing this he is attacked and denounced and his life threatened by the members of his own Church. Had he been a better Catholic (as defined by the Church) than citizen, there would have been no such furore as has been created.—P. S. B.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

LI.

My dear Cardinal:

I have had to set aside the material I was preparing for this issue in order to give space to the sensational events of the day in New York City—the startling revelations made known to the public in such a courageous manner by Mayor Mitchel, and discovered by means of tapping the telephone wires of persons under suspicion by the police.

I say "sensational" and "startling," for they are so to the great majority. To you, Cardinal, and to me, they are neither one nor the other, for *we know* they are nothing unusual in your Church. To you, no doubt, it appears most unfortunate that the underground machinations of Catholic priests should transpire, but I thank God for this significant revelation and that it has come through a member of your own Church.

The scenes being enacted before the Thompson Legislative Committee are epoch making. May they open the eyes of many to the truths I have been trying to impress upon the minds of my readers!

Mayor Mitchel, in his capacity as representative of the citizens of New York, accuses some priests occupying prominent positions in your Church of four crimes, viz.:

Perjury.

Criminal libel.

Conspiracy to utter criminal libel.

Conspiracy to pervert and obstruct justice and prevent the due administration of law.

The bold stand for the right taken by Mayor Mitchel merits the admiration of every honest man, and I hope that when your Church pours out upon him the vials of her hatred and fury which she has stored up against her enemies, he will be strong to endure to the end as valiantly as he has begun.

Needless to say, he has my entire sympathy and heartiest congratulations. By his action he proves himself to be a true American citizen who thoroughly believes in the complete separation of Church and State. It is evident that his ideal is the fulfilment of his duty, and that his regard for the Church is based

upon his conception of her as the fosterer of high ideals. Like many another Catholic layman, he is still entirely blind as to her true character, but I have no doubt that as soon as he realizes the conspiracy of these priests, which to him, as a true man, is so abhorrent, to be in reality not only blessed by the Church, but an act which but faintly reproduces the conduct of the Church throughout the ages of her history, I am quite sure that he will break with her.

In my last letter, Cardinal, in contradiction to a statement you make in your "Faith of Our Fathers," I said, *"Absolute surrender of manhood, reasoning powers and personal freedom* are the essential requisites for becoming a good Catholic." Mayor Mitchel no doubt considers himself a good Catholic, without ever seeing the necessity for such absolute self-surrender, but doubtless he is to find out his mistake.

Indeed, I hope and pray that the day may soon come when he, and others like him, may realize that if the Catholic countries of Europe and South America are so destitute of lofty ideals, it is only because they have been corrupted by the Church, and that, as the United States has opened her arms to many from those lands who could not live there, but who have found a flourishing prosperity in the atmosphere of freedom, so, also, would she carry the light of liberty to these countries themselves if only the American people would awake to action before the Church succeeds in putting out that light.

That Mayor Mitchel does have the true conception of American ideals is proven by his declaration:

"We hold that the Government shall not lay its hands on the sacred altar of the Church, and that conversely the Church must not lay its hands on the sacred altar of the Government.

"And, gentlemen," added the Mayor, banging his fist on the table, "so long as I am Mayor of this city it never shall."

From this it would appear that Mayor Mitchel either differs greatly from his Church, or, as we claim is the case with so many Catholics, he is ignorant of her spirit.

The Church recognizes no altars but those she herself raises and "consecrates" to her own service. For her there can be no such thing as "the sacred altar of the State," nor may any good Catholic recognize it as such unless *she* has bent the Govern-

ment to her will and made of it a place of sacrifice—the sacrifice of patriotism, truth, sincerity and manhood.

But a later statement of Mayor Mitchel proves conclusively that he does not understand his own Church. He said:

"It is not the Catholic Church which has so conspired to pervert justice and obstruct or control Government, but a small group within the Church, co-operating with a few non-Catholic laymen. It is this group I charge with conspiracy.

"This group, I am convinced, is not representative of the Church or of the great body of right-thinking, honest Catholics of this city."

I am glad to know that there is a great body of Catholics in New York who think as Mayor Mitchel does and approve his attitude, but I hope to prove to them that for the conduct of the priests in the case the Church, and only the Church, is responsible.

I am sure that Mayor Mitchel cannot entirely overlook the fact that the very men involved in this case ought, on account of their official position, to be the true representatives of the Church. One is a monsignor and chancellor of the Diocese of New York, and he could not occupy the position he does without having proven himself to be an expert in political intrigue.

However, I do not wonder at Mayor Mitchel's blindness, even in the face of these facts, as only a short time before my leaving the Church, although in my intercourse with high authorities I had been undeceived again and again as to their integrity, I was still able to write with the whole conviction of my soul to Leo XIII.: "Holy Father, I am convinced that there is only One who is just—Jesus Christ—and He is just both in His Person and in His representative—your Holiness." It was only when my mind was confronted with the terrible dilemma—that either the pope must be responsible for the existing conditions in the Church, or else he had not freedom of action or power to control it—that I was obliged to admit that either he was as criminal as the rest of the hierarchy, or so sinfully weak that he could not be what he claimed to be.

Nothing could better serve to enlighten the minds of Mayor Mitchel and the great body of honest Catholics he refers to as

to the real purposes and aims of their Church than the present case.

Let them watch the attitude of the Church, the means she will employ to justify her priests and every little detail of the proceedings. Mayor Mitchel's sense of justice will receive a shock when he sees that, while he and his family are made a target for the hatred and villification of the Church, his opponents will be rewarded as heroes and martyrs.

He will be forced to the realization that truth, justice and charity are scarcely to be found among the high dignitaries of your Church, or among the candidates for these high places. The higher his experience goes, the greater will be his disappointment. Virtue may be found among the devout and lowly in the Catholic Church, but rarely in high stations. There noble ideals give way to hypocrisy, egotism, ambition, untruthfulness, despotism, injustice. It is a far cry from the simple peasant, ignorant and superstitious but sincerely devout, or the priest of a poverty-stricken and remote parish, who spends his days in works of self-sacrifice, a slave to his blinded conscience, striving to be a true father to his people, to those whom they look up to with such veneration, and who know not the meaning of consecration or self-denial, but spend thousands upon themselves, living lives of luxury, securely entrenched in posts of honor and accepting the praises of the multitude as their just due.

And nothing must be allowed to shake their security; whoever dares to breathe a whisper to their discredit must be crushed.

If Mayor Mitchel doubts what I say, or thinks I exaggerate, let him go to any priest in New York and confess. If he receives absolution and is admitted to communion, without first making a public apology to Monsignor Dunn and the priests concerned, I can prove by the authorities of the Church that his confessor has not performed his duty, but has incurred *ipso facto* suspension *a divinis*. I should even go farther and say that if Father Dunn has any knowledge of ecclesiastical proceedings, or has a good canonist at hand to consult, he would have no difficulty in proving that such a priest had incurred major excommunication reserved to the pope.

In requiring an apology from Mayor Mitchel they would be too clever to try to oblige him to say: "I told a lie." Mayor

Mitchel, if he is as sincere as I believe him to be, would no doubt refuse utterly to make such a statement. In view of the undeniable facts it would also be too bare-faced an untruth, for every one would see the object was to shield the priests. But the Mayor would be required to say something to this effect: "I have wronged the Church by denouncing Monsignor Dunn and the other reverend fathers." This, interpreted by the Catholic conscience, is a fact, and it would serve as sufficient foundation for the Church to publish in every land that Mayor Mitchel had recanted and declared himself to have been a calumniator of the Church, having charged to her what he had seen in Protestant institutions, etc., etc., *ad libitum*.

What is the reason for all this? The Mayor will find out there is but one reason: *The System*.

If your Church, as you claim, Cardinal, were of divine origin, she would uphold the standard of love and truth, justice and virtue, as formulated by the Divine Author of Christianity.

But as it becomes palpable to those who penetrate her inner circle that her origin is far from being divine, and that her real object is not the glory of God, but the aggrandizement of a man, all that seemed inexplicable becomes plain. One man, even though he be the greatest despot on earth, cannot impose his will upon others unaided. He needs to enlist the services of others and so grapple them together by hooks of steel that they shall form one solid mass, impossible to disintegrate. Such is the papal hierarchy, and with them the pope must share his honors and distribute among them emoluments at the expense of the foolish herd of "the faithful."

It is truly diverting to read in your "Faith of Our Fathers" that the Church "has not one set of doctrines for bishops and priests and another for the laity." Indeed, you are right. The doctrines are for the laity—bishops and priests have at their disposal thousands of ways to interpret them, so that they may live as they please!

You go on to say, "She has the same doctrines for all—for the pope and the peasant." I need quote only two canonical axioms to controvert this statement, *i. e.*: "He who makes the law is greater than the law, and therefore is not bound by the

law," and: "He who makes the law can alter it or dispense from it."

With these principles as a basis, no system can be just. The Church, then, means the pope and the hierarchy—everything must be sacrificed to their interests. They form a great trust—a close corporation—a mutual aggrandizement league, and as they participate in mutual honors, so must they be ever vigilant in mutual defense.

We need not expect a bishop, therefore, to avow the guilt of a chancellor of the archdiocese, if such avowal is damaging to the Church.

You know all this is true, Cardinal, and all I can hope and pray is that God may open the eyes of your simple-minded followers. I will close with a monastic tale which, as many of them do, contains a more pointed lesson than many a sermon or book of theology:

San Fidel de Sinmaringa was, as you may know, a lawyer before he entered the Capuchin order. To show that few lawyers can enter Heaven, it is said that at the door of Heaven there is a grape-vine for the lawyers, with a great cluster of grapes, and only one grape is missing, the one that was given to San Fidel when he entered Heaven.

A Father, commenting on this story, said, "Yes, but St. Peter has also a cask of wine for the superiors of convents, bishops and cardinals, and he has never had a chance to tap it!"

MANUEL FERRANDO.

CENTRE-SHOTS AT CURRENT ISSUES

BY GEORGE P. RUTLEDGE.*

According to the "Courier-Journal," Father Adalbert, of St. Louis, recently made a few remarks in Louisville, three of which we shall quote:

It (the Roman Church) is the only Church to-day that can trace its origin back to the days of Jesus Christ.

The "apostolic succession" dogma is the most ridiculous claim of Roman Catholicism. It crawls back through the darkness,

*Author of "Centre-shots at Rome" and "Pushing the World Along." Cloth, 12mo. Price, each, postpaid, $1. The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, O.

licentiousness and murder with which the history of the Vatican reeks; it takes a somersault over the two and a half years' reign of the woman pope, Joan; it shies around the three-headed papacy, in which historians (Catholic historians included) recognize Benedict IX., Sylvester III. and Gregory VI. as Peter's acclaimed successors; it finally reaches Boniface III. in the seventh century; then it leaps from the springboard of tradition across the remaining centuries to the Apostle Peter. This "apostolic succession" doctrine is some acrobat—it's a wonder Barnum didn't capture it!

All genuine progress and civilization in the world is due to her (the Catholic Church), as every fair-minded historian will tell you.

The "fair-minded historians" are evidently products of our own day who have not yet made their bow to the public. We presume the histories they have written are yet in manuscript form and are vainly seeking publishers. And, by the way, publishers who scan these manuscripts and then send them on their way, make a mistake—such a history would be a novelty and sell like "hot cakes."

The recognized histories—some of them written by Catholics—take issue with the St. Louis priest's statement.

She (the Catholic Church) will last to judgment day.

With this we fully agree. And the judgment day is fast approaching. The people, especially in this country, are beginning to open their eyes; they already behold the hand of Roman Catholicism appropriating public treasure and otherwise violating our laws; their vision will become keener and farther reaching with the passing of the years, and eventually Rome's judgment day and the day of her retribution will come bounding in.

For about two years we have made general and specific charges against the Catholic Church—charges that any court in the land would recognize. We have named Catholic institutions and openly accused them of law violation. We have even specified public treasuries that have been robbed, stating dates and amounts and referring to sections and pages of records in public offices. Why have we never been arrested? The Standard

Publishing Company is liable for any misrepresentation in the columns of its publications—why has it never been called into court? It's our opinion that there's a reason.

Watson's magazines and other publications have figured in the courts as a consequence of having employed language represented to have been unfit for public print, and a few papers have printed the alleged K. of C. oath and tumbled into trouble.

We have let the oath alone, and likewise spoken in language that the law permits. But we have made charges far more detrimental to Romanism than the alleged oath or illegal language. And every charge we have ever made can be supported—this is why the law does not strike with vengeance, in either Cincinnati or Columbus.

Other publishers and writers are pursuing the same course, and this course will be pursued by a growing army of housetop shouters until the people, as a whole, are wide awake—then the judgment day will be extended a hearty welcome by our patient uncle, whose name is "Sam."

The "North American" recently quoted Father H. M. O'Neil's great sermon, delivered from the pulpit of the Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, Pa. We say it was great, and we shall prove it by reproducing some statements in the news item:

> Father O'Neil painted the bachelor as a man who usually is of little value to any community, and who, with rare exceptions, leads a selfish life.
>
> Bachelors, he said, seldom accomplish much in life. They are not the men who are found at the head of the great movements for the betterment of the community.
>
> They are not the leaders in civil affairs, but go on in their own selfishness, living out the natural order and rarely doing their share for humanity.

We are not personally acquainted with Father O'Neil, but we have an idea he is a bachelor. Moreover, we are informed, upon good authority, that all Catholic priests are bachelors.

It has been intimated of late that the great movements for the betterment of communities and the affairs of civic righteousness are not headed and led by Catholic priests. Various explanations have been made, but the explainers have looked at the situation from divergent viewpoints. However, all guessing has

been brushed out of the way, and we are no longer left in the wilderness of speculation. Father O'Neil, an authority on the subject, has told us all about it—it's because Catholic priests are all bachelors.

It's too bad that the Catholic Church compels her priests to lead selfish lives, and also deprives them of leadership in movements for the betterment of communities and civic righteousness. But we can't help it—we have done what we could. For several years we have called attention to the irregularities of the Catholic system, and we have tried to do an honest job. When we started in, we knew some things would be difficult to adjust, and we are, therefore, not discouraged. The week after our reference to the "Catholic Telegraph's" editorial on "sobriety," on one page, and a column of liquor advertisements on another, all the rum ads. slipped from the pages of this paper, and it has now had a clean face for more than a year. We therefore feel that our efforts have not been wholly in vain. But this bachelor business in the Catholic Church is too widespread to be shot out of existence at one pop, or a series of pops.

But now that Father O'Neil is training his rapid-fire gun on the iniquity, let us hope that he will be able to put an end to it. And he hit "centre" all right. He included all bachelors—didn't miss a single one—not Ben, even.

WHY NUNS CUT OFF THEIR HAIR

We have seen this practise discussed by some, giving business enterprise as a reason, and even going so far as to give statistics of considerable gains accruing to the Church from the sale of nuns' hair. Others see in it nothing but the religious motive. Her hair being a woman's glory, the nun renounces it, together with all worldly vanities.

We know that fabulous sums have been, and are being, paid for this article of merchandise, and that it has been converted into a source of considerable revenue. But, to tell the truth, this form of financial interest was not the original cause for the practise, nor were piety and self-mortification. The origin was really a fraud to evade the law.

In connection with the law of immunity there arose great dis-

putes on account of abuses. In many instances the taking of a vow of chastity was considered sufficient to entitle any one to immunity and the receiving of benefices. So it became necessary to restrict these privileges by legislation. The civil power refused to acknowledge a vow as entitling an individual to immunity of clerics, maintaining that only those ordained *in sacris* should have this privilege. Consequently only priests and those who had been admitted to the diaconate, which by the vow of chastity separated them from the world and introduced them to the state of clerics, were granted immunity.

But this did not suit the Church, as in many cases she ran the risk of losing munificent legacies, it being not always easy to find an heir to such legacies who would be willing to renounce a sweetheart and enter upon an ecclesiastical career just to favor the Church in this respect.

So the Church started another controversy by declaring that the *tonsure* was in reality the first step toward the priesthood, and that all *tonsurates* should be immune. This point was finally won by intrigue, and as the conferring of the tonsure did not require the taking of any vow, or the making of any promise, it was easy for the Church to confer it even upon a little child, who by this act became the recipient of great incomes to be administered by the Church as his legitimate guardian.

Then another question arose. In cases where the faithful endowed nuns, or nuns' convents, Church and State once more came into conflict over the possession of the endowments, as the nuns were not clerics, and therefore not entitled to immunity. So the Church cut off their hair and included them among the "tonsurates," in order that they might enjoy the same privileges. This was a fraud such as is frequently perpetrated by the Church, in which she sticks to the letter of the law while violating its spirit. The law granted the benefit to those who bore the tonsure as being initiated into the priesthood. The nun is not *materia apta* for the priesthood, so in the mind of the Church she is not initiated by the tonsure into the priesthood. However, the Church succeeded in blinding the judges of "the world," and filling her own pockets, by means of this subterfuge.

But how times change! In olden days the nun lost her hair to gain benefices for the Church; to-day she has lost the benefices

and must make up for it to some extent by the sale of her hair.

In the ceremony of receiving a benefice the nun, or her proxy, presented her hair on a salver as the sign of her title to the benefice by having received the tonsure. The civil authority accepted it and gave her in return the title-deed, or certificate of the benefice. But governments have had their eyes opened, and, following the declaration of the Church that stealing from a thief is not stealing at all, they have taken away the benefices and unceremoniously refused to receive the hair of the nuns. What can the poor nuns do with it but offer it to the faithful and make as good a business out of it as they can by trading on religious fanaticism? Don't be hard on the poor things; so much good merchandise should not go to waste!

It was a custom in Spain, when a would-be nun was poor and unable to bring a dowry, for the Church to receive her and present her shorn tresses to some wealthy lady of high degree. In return for this honor the dowry would be paid to the Church, and the nun's locks would be put in a handsome frame under glass and hung in a conspicuous place in the drawing-room of the titled patroness. I remember in my childhood seeing many such gruesome mural decorations in the houses of friends as well as members of my own family. There were even the tonsures of priests, carefully mounted on paper and framed. Sometimes these sacred objects were hung in oratories, and the more there were of them the greater the honor to the family that possessed them.

In little villages in Spain it was a common thing for the descendants of former greatness to boast that their grandfather or great-grandfather had possessed so many "switches," which, of course, signified that he had been rich enough to pay so many nuns' dowries.

Nowadays, no doubt, few of these hallowed switches reach the habitations of wealth, except by way of the hairdresser's shop and for the adornment of milady's head, instead of her walls!

Editor.

MONSIGNOR DUNN'S DENIAL

BY THE EDITOR.

The people of the United States will, I am confident, learn more from this case of the Charities investigation than from all that has been said or written about the morals of the Roman Church.

Father Dunn has denied the charges made against him, and he has denied them under oath. For my part, I have no respect for his oath, his denial, nor himself. If he had kept quiet, some respect might be due him, but as he has had the effrontery to speak, I conclude that he is an expert in the sophistry of his Church, and is determined to use it in his defense, regardless of consequences to others. No one who knows the application of the doctrines of his Church with regard to taking oath can believe him, and the sooner our courts of justice and American citizens in general become informed upon this subject, the sooner will they perceive the need of taking some radical steps with regard to Catholic jurymen and witnesses.

I understand how a Protestant may be reluctant to believe that a Catholic priest or conscientious layman could swear falsely or commit perjury. Moreover, should he read Roman legislation on this or any other subject, he would find the law to be perfect in every respect. No Roman canonical authority in good standing fails to condemn perjury as a hideous crime, and the reader, not knowing anything about cognate subjects nor the application of correlative laws, would undoubtedly exclaim: "That is enough! Everything that is said to the contrary is a lie and a base calumny!" But right here is an important point, which Protestants, being ignorant of, do not bear in mind. It is that, if a Catholic priest or honest layman does not admit the authority of the judge to administer an oath, the oath is not binding—indeed, it is not held to be an oath at all. And it is, therefore, held that where there is not a properly rendered oath there can be no perjury. Liguori teaches that to suppress truth in answering one who interrogates unjustly is no injustice.

This hint should be enough to show my readers that to know the application of the Church's laws, and the myriad ways there are to escape them, is fully as important as to know the laws themselves.

Now, let us see what it is expedient to know with regard to this matter of taking oath. The Church teaches that it is lawful to take oath, and that one is obliged to tell the truth when under oath. This seems good. But if we read all that the best ecclesiastical authorities have to say on this subject, we are forced to the conclusion that, strictly speaking, Rome recognizes only one kind of oath as binding. This comprises the monastic and priestly vows, and the oath administered by ecclesiastical authority.

I shall make use in the discussion of this subject of the two greatest authorities of the Church on moral theology, La Croix and Scavini, whose works serve as a basis for all others of like character.

An oath is defined as calling upon God to witness in a just cause, and in order to be valid it must be administered by one having *proper authority*, in a *proper place* and in *proper form*.

To fulfil the condition of *proper authority*, the judge who administers the oath must be duly constituted and must have competency in the case.

In the whole United States there is not a single judge who is duly constituted in the canonical sense. Neither the Government nor the laws of this country are included in the body of the canon, and therefore are not binding in the strict sense of the canon. They are tolerated, but not incorporated in it.

A duly constituted judge is one who receives his authority from the Church, or from an authority above him but subordinate to the Church; and a law, to be binding, has to be accepted or approved by the Church as being in harmony with the laws and principles of the Church. The authority of the public functionaries of this country does not come from the source of all authority, the pope, but from the people, who, according to canon law, have no authority and can confer none.

So it follows that, lacking the requisite of proper authority, any Catholic may disregard the oath administered in our civil courts, if he chooses to do so, without being held guilty of perjury by his Church, and I doubt if there is any priest, who, if he had the opportunity to do so in the confessional, would not feel it his duty to instruct a witness to equivocate in court, if the disclosure of the truth might be damaging to the Church.

Some may ask whether, in case the judge is a Roman Catho-

lic, as so many are in this country, the sworn witness is not obliged to tell him the truth? I answer: No. According to canon law no Catholic may accept an appointment as judge from an authority which is not subject to the Church, but in these times it has not only been tolerated but strongly recommended that Catholics shall secure all the Government positions possible in order to advance the cause and the influence of the Church; and a Catholic judge must always bear in mind that in the discharge of his duty he should endeavor to favor the Church and not go against her interests when they conflict with the interests of the State. If a Catholic judge had to hear a case which he knew to be damaging to the Church and should consult his confessor, he would be advised that, unless he felt his absence would bring about worse results, he ought to seek some excuse for making a journey, or feign sickness, so that some other judge would have to take the case. So a witness is no more bound to tell the truth under an oath administered by a Catholic judge in this country than by a non-Catholic.

Competency in the case, or jurisdiction, may refer to the person of the judge or to the nature of the case. No secular judge has competency to deal with questions pertaining to the Church, or ecclesiastics, unless the proper ecclesiastical court has transferred jurisdiction to him, by sentence of the ecclesiastical judge, after due trial.

The requirement of *proper place* means that, to be valid, the oath must be administered by a duly constituted authority sitting in court. A secular judge cannot administer an oath in an ecclesiastical court, neither can an ecclesiastical judge do so in a civil court.

As to the *proper form* required for the validity of an oath, any Catholic may disregard the oath administered in our civil courts without a qualm, and no moralist or confessor could call him to task. The oath, as we have said, is the calling upon God to witness in a just cause. To believe that a heretic can duly call upon God to witness is blasphemy. That would mean that a Catholic who believes in the authority of a non-Catholic judge in our courts to administer an oath commits a mortal sin. The form, moreover, of the oath used in this country is not canonical, and therefore not binding.

Although Fathers Dunn, Farrell, Dineen and Higgins appeared before the committee to deny under oath the charges brought against them by Mayor Mitchel, this fact has very little weight with me. It seems to me more like a desperate attempt to defend themselves by trying to discredit Mayor Mitchel, who up to the present time has been prominent as a Knight of Columbus and a good Catholic, but appears now as a man without religion and a rascal, at least in the estimation of Monsignor Dunn. We have seen that these priests cannot acknowledge authority to administer the oath they took, therefore to them it is a mere formality and not binding, and they feel free to represent things in whatever way seems best to them—*for the good of the Church and to avoid scandal.*

Let us notice some of Father Dunn's statements. In answer to Mayor Mitchel's charge that he had offered to give Dr. Potter $100 so that he could leave the State, he says: "I called up Dr. Potter to advise him that a person with whom he wished an appointment was available. Dr. Potter then told me that he was going out of town. He said he expected to be away only forty-eight hours. Then it came to me like an inspiration. I realized that this was the opportunity I had waited for. I said to Dr. Potter, 'I will send you one hundred.' I did not say 'dollars,' but of course that was the inference. He said, 'No, I don't want it.'

"That took place on Friday, March 24th, and the next Monday I was subpœnaed to appear before the Strong Committee. I felt sure that our wires were being tapped, so I threw out this bait, which they grabbed as a fish rises to a fisherman's bait. This proved to me that I was correct in my wire-tapping suspicions."

Father Dunn's use of language is picturesque, almost dramatic —but he gives himself away. I am interested to know from his own lips that he sometimes says things with purpose to deceive, or, to use his own figure, throws out bait like a fisherman. I wonder how many of his Catholic dupes grab eagerly like fish the ecclesiastical bait he throws. But as Father Dunn is such an expert fisherman, he may have just been experimenting to see whether the Strong Committee would swallow his bait whole or not.

For my part I can see no object in throwing out the bait he

did for the suspected wire-tappers. What did he mean by "one hundred"? If they were not dollars, what were they? Kisses over the telephone for Dr. Potter? But if it is not clear why he should be throwing out bait on March 24th, I do see a reason for exercising his skill as a fisherman on May 25th.

I wish I could have been there to interrogate Father Dunn. My ecclesiastical training would have stood me in good stead, and I am quite sure, in spite of his astuteness in the use of mental reservation, he could not have evaded my questions. The trouble with those judges who know nothing about mental reservation is that they do not know how to put a question to prevent the witness making use of it.

Mr. Moss, for instance, asked Father Dunn if he had ever given Dr. Potter $100. "I never gave Dr. Potter a dollar," the witness declared, "and he never asked me for any money." This question shows very little shrewdness, while the answer is a model of sophistry. Mr. Moss knew that Father Dunn did not himself give Dr. Potter $100. Mayor Mitchel had not said so. The conversation he reported said explicitly that neither Father Dunn was to give it, nor Dr. Potter to receive it. What Mayor Mitchel did report was that Father Dunn was going to put it in a sealed envelope and a messenger from Dr. Potter was going to take it. Father Dunn's declaration that he never gave Dr. Potter *a dollar* is also a clever evasion. The question concerned *one hundred dollars*, not *one*, and he could be quite truthful, according to the Catholic conception of truth, even in the misleading statement that Dr. Potter *never asked him for any money*. The reported conversations show that he freely offered to give Dr. Potter the money so that he should have no difficulty in leaving the State. Father Dunn must think Mr. Moss is a very hungry fish!

In connection with the appearance of Father Dunn and the other priests in court, a little incident is reported in the most matter-of-fact way without any comment, although in reality it is most significant. It shows how the Roman Church is craftily pushing herself forward and claiming privileges for herself, and people are so blind, or so culpably tolerant, that they do not even notice it. When Monsignor Dunn took the stand he said he was willing to "waive immunity." This is the first time I ever heard of a priest here in the United States publicly claiming immunity. If

he has the effrontery to claim it in defiance of the laws of the land, the waiving of it must also be a "bait," but I am glad I am not the *fish* to rise to it.

The other priests followed Father Dunn's cue, and "waived immunity" also, and when Dr. Potter took the stand he was asked, in joke, I suppose, whether he was willing to waive immunity.

He answered, "Oh, yes, I will waive anything. I will wave the American flag." Dr. Potter has been associating so familiarly with past masters of the art of equivocation that perhaps he has learned something of that slippery accomplishment, and his pun may have another meaning. It may be he is hinting that he is willing to *waive* his allegiance to the American flag, if it is made worth his while to serve the Roman potentate.

But to return to the subject under discussion, from what has been said concerning the requirements prescribed by the Roman Church for the administration of a valid oath to a Roman Catholic it will be evident to every one who is fair-minded and reasonable that a Catholic can scarcely be depended upon to tell the truth in court, especially if he is a priest, or under the instruction of a priest, and if the case involves anything damaging to the Church or even to himself. And this becomes the more evident if we make a study of the different means a witness may employ to escape committing perjury, although obscuring the truth, *even when there is no question concerning the aforesaid requisites of proper authority, place and form.*

It is important for those who are not conversant with the Roman system to realize that its perversity and consequent menace consists in the distinction it makes between one sin and another. Perjury is denounced as a most hideous crime, to which attach great and severe penalties, such as "irregularity" and degradation. A lie, on the other hand, is only a mortal sin at worst; in many cases it may be only venial, because of attenuating circumstances; and in some cases it may not be a sin at all, but may even take on the semblance of a virtue.

So, a witness might not scruple to tell an absolute lie under oath, knowing he may find easy forgiveness; but he will be careful to avoid the crime of perjury. It is very difficult to determine what really constitutes a lie in Roman moral theology, but we cannot touch upon that question here. Our object is to show

how a witness who tells an untruth or avoids telling the truth can escape the accusation of perjury. There are so many ways of escape that the reader would have to wade through ponderous volumes to find them all, but two or three of the principal ones will suffice for our present purpose.

The first way of escape, in case of all requirements being fulfilled, is through *intention.* A witness may take an oath with the intention of not binding himself by it. This is condemned by Innocent XI. (Proposition 25). But as the Roman authors know that certain prohibitions of the Church are made only for the sake of appearances, they have set themselves to discover ways to evade the issue, and even rigorists who defend it admit that the transgressing of this prohibition does not constitute perjury. So the individual in the case is sure of one thing, that even if there may be some discussion as to the validity or non-validity of swearing without intention, in doing so he does not commit perjury, and very seldom is this act accounted a mortal sin. Exception is made when an individual is interrogated under oath by his bishop, or his superior, in the case of monks, but not even the regular ecclesiastical court is included in this exception.

The argument, as stated by La Croix, is that, as one who recites a prayer without intention to pray does not receive the benefit of the prayer, but at worst only commits a venial sin by not rendering due reverence to the name of God, so one who swears without intention makes the oath of none effect and cannot incur the condemnation attached to perjury. He also commits only a venial sin by taking the name of God in vain when he repeats the formula of the oath. And the peculiarity of this case is, that should he be summoned before an ecclesiastical court to defend himself against an accusation of perjury, he needs to bring forward no witnesses nor present any proofs to clear himself. He merely has to say, "I took the oath without intention," and the matter is closed. Should he have the misfortune to be brought before a court of rigorists, he may appeal to another court which will absolve him.

Another way to escape perjury is by *equivocation,* which is unquestionably allowed. As La Croix declares, To swear with equivocation when there is a just cause is licit, and is not wrong, because to hide the truth without telling a lie does not constitute

any irreverence to the oath. Authors make a distinction between equivocation *mentalis* and *pure mentalis*, but this distinction is only made for the benefit of the superior, that he may learn how to question, so as to prevent the use of equivocation by the witness. Equivocation has two forms—mental reservation and a play on words.

Mental reservation is employed when an oath is taken with an unspoken mental condition, viz.; The United States Government asks a foreigner, a Roman Catholic, to take the oath of allegiance, and he swears to be loyal to the Government of the United States, with the unspoken reservation, "except in such things as the pope may oppose it." He swears that he will defend the United States against all other world powers, with the reservation, "except the pope."

In the same way a man may commit murder and deny it under oath. If he is asked, "Did you kill that man?" he may answer, "I did not kill him (to divulge the crime)," or, "I did not kill him (at night, or in this or that way)," etc. A witness may be asked if he saw a crime committed, and he may answer, "No," with the mental reservation that he "did not see it to tell it," or he did not see it "through a window," or, "with his glasses on," etc.

It is said of St. Francis that he was going along a road with his hands tucked in the sleeves of his habit, as prescribed by the monkish rule, when a thief, escaping from his pursuers, ran past him. When the officers came up they asked St. Francis if he had seen any one running by that way, and, pulling his hands out, he answered, "No, no one went by this way" (meaning through his sleeves).

So Father Dunn may say, "I never gave Dr. Potter a dollar" (meaning, "I never gave him only *one* dollar"), and feel he is following the example of St. Francis.

Often equivocation by a play on words may be used as a way to escape from perjury. La Croix gives an amusing example of a word with two meanings. A man kills a Gaul, and in court he is asked if he has killed *Gallum*. *Gallum*, in Latin (the language used by La Croix in his works), means either a native of Gaul or a *cock*. The accused swears that he has not killed *Gallum* (meaning a cock), and does not commit perjury, nor tell a lie.

We might go on indefinitely giving examples of many other different ways to escape the law, but the above will suffice to prove how little weight have the denials of the priests in the present case.

THE SECRET CODE OF THE POPE

This cipher code, more than 200 years old, became divulged inadvertently in 1911. What the Vicar of Christ, the ruler of the faithful, the infallible, needs with a cipher code may be understood by politicians better than by the sanctified.

A Chicago dispatch, printed in the "Washington Post" of January 16, 1911, says:

"The Vatican has been compelled to change the cipher, or code, in which the pope's secret instructions are telegraphed to nuncios and delegates abroad. It consists of a series of secret numbers disposed according to a prearranged system, assuring perfect secrecy. Repeated efforts to solve it proved unsuccessful, and it was considered the best in the world.

Even when the French Government seized the archives of the papal nunciature in Paris the secret was not divulged. Monsignor Montagnini succeeded in hiding the key.

"Marquis Crispolti, however, published a book dealing with the Vatican's negotiations with Berlin in 1878, reproducing the original cipher telegrams and their translations.

"The pope, deeply grieved that the secret documents had been published, and realizing the futility of legal proceedings, has decided to change the system, for the first time in 200 years."

This is but another evidence of Rome combatting Civil Law. another evidence of its repudiation of the rights of nations.

When the tiara is placed on the head of a pope it is with these words:

"Receive the tiara, adorned with three crowns; and know that thou art father of princes and kings, ruler of the world, vicar of our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

When the Republic of Portugal came into being, the American cardinal did not hesitate to condemn it as "interfering with the rights of the pope," which is another evidence that the Church of Rome does not recognize the sovereign rights of nations.